



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME PREPAREDNESS FACTS

OUR Secretary of the Navy is authority for the statement, made before the present war, that "the naval appropriations in our country have doubled in a dozen years, and have gone up by leaps and bounds in other countries. If this mad rivalry in construction goes on the burden will become too heavy for any nation to bear." Within a few years the cost of battleships has risen from about \$5,000,000 each to \$20,000,000, and ship materials and munitions of war have advanced over 30 per cent.

But such facts are relatively unimportant compared with the additional fact that the navy of the United States is today superior to that of Germany or any other nation except that of Great Britain. The program now before us represents an increase in one year of an amount in excess of our total increase for the last fourteen years. Indeed, in a time of peace we propose an annual increase exceeding the increase by Germany during the whole fifteen years preceding the European war, and more than the combined increase of all the nations in the world during any one year in their history. The program proposes to increase in five years our naval appropriation forty times the increase by Germany during any similar period of years. More than this, it represents an amount \$200,000,000 in excess of the combined increase of all the nations of the world for a similar period of years. Why do our preparedness friends fail to tell us that for years we have been spending every year from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 upon our navy in excess of the amount spent by Germany or any other nation except Great Britain?

The \$500,000,000 naval program, \$100,000,000 less than will be required to put it into effect, does not include what we are now spending, but, to the generous appropriation already made, that amount in addition. The army program, representing an increase of more than 100 per cent over our present appropriations for that branch of our service, calls also for a sum reaching nearly \$500,000,000 increase, that is to say, extra!

As pointed out by Mr. Kitchin, the United States is being asked to expend upon its army and navy more than any other nation of the world, in times of peace, ever expended upon its army and navy. Is it of no significance that, at the beginning of the European war, Germany was expending for past wars and preparedness for wars—that is to say, on its army and navy—55 per cent of the total amount of revenues collected; Japan, 45 per cent; Great Britain, 37 per cent; France, 35 per cent; the United States, 60 per cent?

Another group of facts not without their bearing is:

Private firms are receiving for 3.8-inch common shrapnel in excess of the cost when manufactured at

Government plants, \$9.56; for a 31-second combination fuse, a profit of \$4.08; for a 3-inch finished shrapnel case, a profit of \$1.31; for gun carriages for 3-inch rifles, \$882.22; caissons, \$615.43; order ammunition, \$979,840.00. Speaking of these figures, former Senator Robert M. La Follette rightfully calls them "outrageous."

But more disheartening than any of these facts is the fact that not one of our hysterical "preparedists" deigns ever to discuss the problems of concrete international policies out of which any rational program for preparedness must necessarily be developed. Not once do they apply their minds to the problem of international organization. Not once do they consider the interests of foreign nations. Not once do they seem to see the necessity for international adjustments, friendly compositions, arbitrations, judicial settlements. They not only do not tell us the truth about the details of their own housekeeping, but they insist upon a choleric interference with all who talk in terms of ordinary morals.

THE HYSTERIA OF IT

WE WOULD respectfully call the attention of our readers to the following facts:

The organ of the Navy League, *The Seven Seas*, in a recent number says: "The true militarist believes that pacifism is the masculine and humanitarianism is the feminine manifestation of national degeneracy. . . . World empire is the only logical and natural aim for a nation. . . . Land has always been the correct alimment for nations, and never till the arrival of the pacifist did gods or men ever witness a nation trying on straight-waistcoats as if they were life-preservers."

We are told that we must have "at least 2,000 aeroplanes ready to be sent into the air at a moment's notice," and that we must have 100,000 officers for our army. Mr. Charles Edward Russell wants a fort every ten miles along our borders, a big naval army on our Great Lakes, compulsory military service, and an army and navy equipment greater than any nation of the world. Rev. Dr. Charles A. Eaton calls this war "the greatest blessing that has fallen upon mankind since the German Reformation." Hudson Maxim considers that a small army and navy are "worse than no army and navy," and that "any one of the great European powers would be able to land a million men on our shores in a few weeks." He adds: "It is not unlikely that some of us will be forced to see wife or daughter or sweetheart namelessly maltreated to gratify the brutal lust of an invader, and lose our own life for a blow on the scoundrel's jaw, unless—aye, there's the rub—unless this whole country awakens to its danger and rises up as one

man and demands prompt and adequate defensive measures for national protection."

Many are crying for compulsory military training in our public schools, notwithstanding that even Prussia has never adopted such a system, and in spite of the fact that France has abolished it on the ground that it is wholly impracticable from a military point of view.

Col. Robert Thompson, of the Navy League, asks for \$500,000,000 to provide a naval military establishment "adequate for national defense," while Mr. Brooks Adams, at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, held at Boston in November, flatly recommended the German military system for the United States. Conscription for free America is on the lips of editors and statesmen.

But this is not all. A writer in a Sunday morning paper of Washington, D. C., informs us that Great Britain is going to occupy New England, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; that France is to get the French parts of eastern Canada, and the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Kentucky; that Germany is going to occupy the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; that Japan is to take the Pacific coast; that Mexico will receive Arizona, New Mexico, and part of Texas; Russia is to take back Alaska; while the remaining western States are to be consolidated into an imperial crown domain of the German empire.

The Hon. Claude Kitchin, Democratic leader of the House of Representatives, flatly accuses the *Seven Seas Magazine* of being an organization "which has created, by deception and misrepresentation, the apparently big sentiment for the militarism and navalism now proposed, and which seems to have stampeded many patriotic and usually level-headed people." Mr. Kitchin believes, and his beliefs are concurred in by not a few whose business it is to know, that the United States is "prepared" now, and that we are already preparing; that the country has been misinformed, and that it is not true that we have been negligent of national defense.

In any event, the statements of facts to which we have called attention demand the serious reflection of thinking men. At best they are evidences of a wild and discouraging hysteria. When Mr. Maxim, Mr. Russell, Mr. Adams and the rest, give us one evidence that they can think in terms of international justice, righteousness, and peace, rather than in terms of mere force, then they will receive more attention from constructive persons interested in overcoming the ethics of the beast.

Since our hysterical friends refuse to listen to counsel from us, we respectfully submit for their consider-

ation the following impressive words from Lord Rosebery, spoken recently at a Rhodes Scholarship lecture in London:

"I know nothing more disheartening than the announcement recently made that the United States—the one great country left in the world free from the hideous, bloody burden of war—is about to embark upon the building of a huge armada destined to be equal or second to our own. It means that the burdens will continue upon the other nations, and be increased exactly in proportion to the fleet of the United States. I confess that it is a disheartening prospect that the United States, so remote from the European conflict, should voluntarily in these days take up the burden which, after this war, will be found to have broken, or almost broken, our backs."

THE PRESIDENT'S NEGLECTED OPPORTUNITY

IN SPITE of our great respect for President Wilson's Pan American outlook, it seems a misfortune that Pan Americanism should spell for him a necessity for an increase of appropriations for our army and navy of over \$100,000,000 a year. If our Pan Americanism be real, we should be stronger, not weaker, because of it. Mr. Bryan, a sincere friend of the President, calls the President's recommendation for additional military preparedness "revolutionary." It is not necessary to agree with this statement, but the following from Mr. Wilson's former Secretary of State seems unanswerable:

"Pan Americanism, if it differs at all from the Monroe Doctrine, ought to lessen rather than increase the necessity for preparedness. If a small army and navy were sufficient to enforce the Monroe Doctrine when the Latin-American countries were suspicious of the United States, why do we need an increase now when that suspicion is removed and when the republics of Central and South America are willing to co-operate with us in the support of the Monroe Doctrine?"

But the trouble with President Wilson's present international program is that he does not sense, at least he does not adequately interpret, our coming obligations to European states. His Manhattan Club address in New York was his first great disappointment. It is a strange and unfortunate thing that our political leaders are content to talk today in terms only of an isolated America. Now is the time for the American republics to concentrate their thought upon the finer international adjustments soon to be the supreme problem of the world. The wild demand for preparedness against dangers which no intelligent man can name reveals a pathetic misconception of the real problem of this age. That the President of the United States has not once expressed any interest in the Congress of Nations surely to follow the European peace is a patent indication of a neglected opportunity.